```
O9AUWERS
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                                23 Cr. 4 (JHR)
                 V.
 5
     BEN WERCZBERGER,
 6
                                              Sentence
                     Defendant.
 7
           ----x
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
 9
                                               September 10, 2024
                                               11:45 a.m.
10
11
      Before:
12
                         HON. JENNIFER H. REARDEN,
13
                                               U.S. District Judge
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
      DAMIAN WILLIAMS
           United States Attorney for the
16
           Southern District of New York
17
     BY: DANIEL HARRIS WOLF
           CATHERINE E. GHOSH
18
           Assistant United States Attorneys
19
     MEISTER SEELIG & FEIN LLP
          Attorneys for Defendant
20
      BY: HENRY E. MAZUREK
           ILANA HARAMITI
21
      Also Present:
22
           Stephanie McMahon, U.S. Probation
23
2.4
25
```

(Case called)

MR. WOLF: Good morning, your Honor. Daniel Wolf and Catherine Ghosh on behalf of the government. At counsel table, as I understand, invited by the Court, is U.S. Probation Officer, Stephanie McMahon.

THE COURT: Yes. Hello to you all.

MR. MAZUREK: And good morning, your Honor. Henry
Mazurek and Ilana Haramati on behalf of Ben Werczberger, who is
present before the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning to you.

Please be seated, everybody. All right. We're here today for sentencing in the United States versus Werczberger.

On April 18, 2024, Mr. Werczberger pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea agreement dated April 13, 2024, to a one-count superseding information S7, charging him with conspiracy to make false statements to a bank in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

In preparation for today's proceeding, I have received and reviewed the probation office's revised presentence investigation report dated July 12, 2024, including its recommendation addendum. I've also reviewed the following submissions from the parties: The defendant's sentencing submission dated August 27, 2024, that consist of letters from Mr. Werczberger and letters from his family, community members, and his physician, also the government's sentencing submission

25

1	dated September 3, 2024.
2	I want to confirm that the parties have received and
3	reviewed each of these submissions.
4	Mr. Mazurek?
5	MR. MAZUREK: Yes, we have, your Honor, with our
6	client.
7	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wolf?
8	MR. WOLF: Yes, we have, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. Are there any other
10	submissions that I did not mention?
11	MR. WOLF: We would simply refer the Court to the
12	victim impact statement that was previously submitted by the
13	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and that I know
14	the Court has received in connection with other defendants in
15	this case.
16	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
17	MR. MAZUREK: And no further submissions other than
18	what your Honor identified from the defense, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	Now, Mr. Werczberger requested to seal certain
21	portions of his submissions, and I believe that those
22	applications were resolved, but is there anything further in
23	that regard that we need to address now?
24	MR. MAZUREK: No, your Honor, not from the defense.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wolf, I'm

25

1	going to just ask this for good measure: So the PSR indicates
2	that the victim of this offense, as you just mentioned, is the
3	Administration for Children and Families, a component of the
4	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. You can confirm,
5	I assume, that ECF has been notified of its rights under the
6	Crime Victims' Rights Act?
7	MR. WOLF: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
9	All right. I'm going to turn now to the presentence
10	investigation report. Mr. Mazurek, you have read the report?
11	Yes?
12	MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor. I reviewed with it my
13	client.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Werczberger, you have read
15	the presentence investigation report as well? Is that right?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
17	THE COURT: All right. And you discussed it with your
18	attorney?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Have you had sufficient time and
21	opportunity to review the report and discuss it with your
22	counsel?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Have you been able to discuss any errors

that you might have seen in the report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you discuss with your counsel anything else that you wish him or them to take up with me today at sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. We discussed it.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wolf, you have also reviewed the presentence investigation report, correct?

MR. WOLF: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Before I turn to the calculation of the sentencing guidelines, I just want to discuss the factual and overall accuracy of the PSR. Now, I did review the objections reflected in the addendum and I reviewed probation's responses to those objections and I find them to be appropriate. I also want to point out that there is a statement on page 33 of the PSR that is -- that is not correct, and I have confirmed this with probation. In the last paragraph on page 33 it says: As such, in taking all factors into consideration, we maintain that a sentence of time served, a variance below the prescribed advisory guidelines range is appropriate in this case pursuant to the factors outlined in 18, U.S.C., 3553(a). The language of variance below the prescribed advisory guidelines range is incorrect. I'm going to strike it.

And, Officer McMahon, I would ask that probation issue a corrected version of PSR, omitting that language.

1 MR. MAZUREK: Thank you, your Honor. 2 MS. McMAHON: Yes. 3 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mazurek, I saw your 4 footnote in your submission going to this point, but I want to 5 confirm it's your view that the PSR is factually accurate? 6 MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Wolf, does the 8 government have any objections? Or do you believe the PSR to 9 be factually accurate? 10 MR. WOLF: We do believe it to be factually accurate. 11 THE COURT: All right. Aside from the revision that 12 we just discussed, and that will be made in the report, I'm 13 going to adopt the factual recitation set forth in the 14 presentence investigation report including the changes that 15 probation incorporated into the report reflected in the 16 addendum, the presentence investigation report will be made 17 part of the record in this matter, it will be placed under 18 If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access seal. 19 to the sealed report without further application to the Court. I am now going to turn to the calculation of the U.S. 20 21 sentencing guidelines in this case. I am not bound by the 22 guidelines, that is to say, they are advisory, but I do have to 23 accurately calculate the quidelines range and consider what the 24 guidelines recommend before imposing an appropriate sentence.

As an initial matter, I not that the November 2023 United

25

States sentencing quidelines control.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The parties' plea agreement calculated a total offense Probation, however, calculated a total offense level of 6. level of 8. In the government's submission the government acknowledges that probation correctly calculated a total offense level of 8, rather than, as the parties did in the plea agreement and an offense level of 6. The dispute concerns 2B1.1(b)(9)(A) of the guidelines which provides that if the offense involved a misrepresentation that the defendant was acting on behalf of a charitable, educational, religious, or political organization, or a government agency, it increased by two levels, if the resulting offense level was less than a level 10, it increased to level 10. Here I find that this factor is met. Accordingly, the Court agrees with probation that the total offense level is 8. I note, however, as probation observed, that despite the difference between the offense level reflected in the plea agreement and that set forth in the PSR, each yields a guidelines range of 0 is six months' imprisonment. I also note the government's statement that it stands by the stipulated guidelines calculation reflected in the plea agreement and further that the different offense level calculations do not impact the custodial quidelines range in any event.

As stated, I have calculated an offense level of 8. I have also calculated a criminal history category of I. This

2.2

yields a guidelines range of zero to six months' imprisonment, a supervised release range of one to three years, and a fine range of \$2,000 to \$20,000.

The plea agreement incorrectly states, based on erroneous calculation of a guidelines level of 6 that the fine range is \$1,000 to \$9,500, as opposed to a range of \$2,000 to \$20,000. The government, nevertheless, seeks a fine of \$9,500 consistent with what's in the plea agreement.

In the plea agreement, both parties agreed not to seek a departure from the guidelines range; is that correct?

MR. WOLF: That's correct.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I've, nevertheless, considered whether there is any basis for departure, and find that there are no grounds justifying a departure here.

With that, I'll turn first to counsel, and then to Mr. Werczberger, if he wishes to say anything.

I have read everyone's sentencing submissions, and you need not repeat anything that you've included in those papers, but, of course, you're welcome to tell me whatever you'd like me to hear today.

So I'll start with the government.

MR. WOLF: Yes, your Honor. I won't repeat what's in our sentencing submissions, I'll just short of briefly emphasize a few things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first is I think what's acknowledged in the PSR as well as, I think at least acknowledged, if not expressly in the defendant's submission, and that is that this particular defendant, at least as noted in the PSR, I think it's described as a happy childhood, a middle-class upbringing with all the basic necessities. As the sentencing submission notes, the defendant is an extremely successful businessman. He's the patriarch of his family. He has a net worth of millions and millions of dollars.

I raise all of these to illustrate the point that the defendant here engaged in conduct not because of financial need, as the Court sometimes sees when sentencing defendants, not because of difficult family circumstances, as the Court sometimes sees, and not because he was placed in a difficult position where, at first he may have not understood when he had gotten into and then quickly and slowly realized and simply couldn't get out. To the contrary, from the government's view, this is a crime of greed and a crime of a defendant believing that the rules that applied to everyone else do not apply to It is a crime a conduct calculating to view government funded childcare as a means to profit, and in particular a means to profit without regard to following the rules, without regard as a board member of a head-start agency entrusted to guard against waste, fraud and abuse, without regard to ensuring that services are being delivered and without regard,

1.3

2.2

I would note, for who else might suffer or be affected negatively for the conduct. And here I will note, that as part of the defendant's conduct, it's not part of the offense conduct, it's not part of the lies that were told to the bank but part of the facts and circumstances relevant to the offense that the defendant swept in his wife and grandson in this conduct, which, in the government's view, is further evidence of the defendant having taken a reckless approach. And one, again, that viewed himself on different footing than others.

All of this is very concerning to the government and worthy of just punishment. There's a need for the sentence imposed to reflect the history and characteristics of the defendant that I just raised to reflect that the defendant knew better and that his crime was committed without, as I said, regard for the rules. His crime was committed in a manner that it was simply okay to lie to a bank in order to obtain a bank account.

There is a need for general deterrence. There is a need to promote general deterrence so that the broader of community of would-be or current members of head-start boards know that consequences will follow if they abdicate their responsibilities.

And there's a need to promote specific deterrence to ensure that this particular defendant will not be tempted to reoffend.

2.2

As I said before, from the government's perspective, there really is a need here to promote respect for the law, a need to promote the notion that all defendants, no matter their socioeconomic status will be treated equally before this Court and all other Courts.

The government has taken into account all of the 3553(a) factors in coming up with its recommendation. We have recommended, we agree with probation that this defendant need not be incarcerated. However, we do take the view that in service of all of the 3553(a) factors that some period of home detention is appropriate. We have recommended six months of home detention as well as a fine at the top of the parties' stipulated guidelines range.

Unless the Court has further questions, the government respectfully refers to our papers.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Mazurek?

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, Judge, we have -- we're going to bifurcate our presentation. Ms. Haramati is going to speak on the issue of the nature and personal characteristics of the defendant and I'll speak on the remainder of the 3553(a) factors, if that's okay with the Court.

THE COURT: Yes. Very good.

MS. HARAMATI: Thank you, Judge. If it's okay with the Court, I'm going to just go to the podium.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. HARAMATI: All right. Thank you, Judge. As Mr. Mazurek said, I'll be addressing the personal history and characteristics of Mr. Werczberger, which really provides an anchor for all federal sentencing. You know, the sentencing statute, as the Court knows, of course, better than I do, directs the Court to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary, and that, of course, means sufficient but not greater than necessary, not just for the crime, not just for the offense conduct, but for the person.

So the salient question for the Court today is not just the contours of the conduct that Mr. Wolf addressed and that Mr. Mazurek is going to address, but -- and it's not just even the sentencing guidelines, but the question is who is Ben Werczberger. He's a superlative person looking beyond this offense conduct. The government mentioned Mr. Werczberger's success and his family. His success and his beautiful family, many of whom are here today, his -- all three of his children, Jacob, Pessi, and Esther are here, as well as their spouses, his wife, Miriam, and literally dozens of grandchildren and their spouses are here to support Mr. Werczberger, and that -- what he has been built, both in his business success, which I'll address, and his family, is his own merit, it's through his own hard work.

I know the Court carefully reviewed all of our

submissions and the letters, so I won't rehash that, but I've gotten to know Mr. Werczberger pretty well over the last almost two years. So there are a couple of things that I just want to highlight for the Court in crafting a sentence of what is sufficient but not greater than necessary for him and why a period of home detention, we submit, is greater than necessary for this -- for this person.

Mr. Werczberger's true essence: It's his grit and his commitment to hard work. He has a heart for charity and community service throughout his life. And he has an unmatched dedication to his family, which is his first priority. It's his pride and it's his joy. That package of attributes and the positive impact that Mr. Werczberger has had on those around him, his employees, his community members and his family, all support a sentence of time served without any further restrictions on his liberty. This is an extraordinary man who is already going to carry for the rest of his life the indelible burden of his felony conviction.

Your Honor, Mr. Werczberger grew up in a home of modest means. It's true he wasn't -- he didn't struggle financially or want for food, but he was a son of two Holocaust survivors who lost everything, and despite that, his parents never gave up. They rebuilt their entire lives from scratch. And Ben learns from his parents' example. He saw that if they

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could persevere and overcome the unthinkable horrors and the unimaginable loss that they endured, he can also persevere, and that is exactly what he did when he faced life's challenges. He took inspiration and example from his parents. When Ben was tested as a young man, he had several severe health challenges that put him into significant medical debt that jeopardized the stability of his family when his children were just babies, you know, many would have despaired under those circumstances, but that's not Ben. Ben took on a second job. He walked door-to-door peddling copy supplies and other office supplies and several nights a week he slaved over a hot oven working as Through his grit and his perseverance Ben regained financial stability to his young family. It was not something that he could take for granted or something that he was born into. And he's taken the lessons of his youth and his parent's house to heart. He imparts them to his grandchildren and hopefully he'll impart them to his great grandchildren when they grow up. Ben's granddaughter, Rachel Dembinsky, I think puts it in an especially nice way, she wrote in her letter that she can see from the twinkle in her grandfather's eye that he's proud of his hard work when he looks back and he recounts those days when he struggled. He's not resting on his laurels. He's using his own struggles as an example.

In middle age, after he faced years of financial struggle, Ben built a successful business. He accomplished

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that through persistence, through hard work, through creativity, and importantly, he accomplished that through listening to the opinions of his peers, his partners, and his employees.

One of -- I want to just note for the Court that one of the letter writers, Herman Goldberger, who is Ben's partner of more than 30 years, is also here before the Court today to support Mr. Werczberger. It was a personal endeavor for him building this business and struggling. About 30 years ago, a little, more Ben found a founded Tiger Supplies. At the time it was a novel idea. It was the first ecommerce business that sold wholesale architectural supplies. And with that good idea and with that persistence, Tiger took off. It has numerous divisions now that sell a pretty surprising array of different kinds of products, professional durable, medical equipment, kitchen cabinet supplies, janitorial supplies, among like -among many others, and Tiger now currently employees approximately 100 employees, all of whom over the decades have looked to Ben for stable jobs and a workplace that cares about them and allows them to thrive, because that's the kind of boss that Ben has been throughout his time.

Ben's son, Jacob, who is also here, has seen that firsthand working for his father over the last 30 years. He recounted for the Court in his letter, I just want to highlight, the real humanity that Ben conducted himself with at

work. Jacob writes that Ben never raised his voice at a coworker, a customer, or a vendor, no matter how stressful the day was. Jacob now runs the company because Ben had to step down as part of the consequences of his felony indictment and felony plea, just because of the realities of the business world made it impossible for him to continue running the company with those marks on his record. And Jacob, who is now at the helm, tries to emulate his father. He knows that his father was the go-to guy for the employees because of the person that he is, and Jacob also is striving to be that same kind of boss that he saw his father be over -- over the decades.

You know, another aspect of Ben that I think is really a hallmark of who he is, is charitable work and his community service. Throughout his life Ben's record shows that he had an understanding that any success he had was dependent on the support of others in the community. He knows he can't go at it alone, and so he knows that he has to give back because nobody can go at it alone. So Ben has always prioritized charity and community service as part of his very ethos. He has a record of literally decades of assisting those in need financially and beyond financial help, devoting his time, leveraging his connections, and his creativity in order to help organizations and people, not just pay for things, but also run organizations efficiently in order to provide the most good for the most

people. You know, he also showed through his own actions, even when he was a struggling -- struggled financially as a young man that charity begins at home, and for him that wasn't just a mantra or a nice saying to repeat to his children every now and again. It was his reality and his guiding principle.

A. I thought that there was one particularly touching story

that I would just note for the Court. His daughter, Ben's daughter, Pessi, who is sitting here in the front row, recalls when she was a young girl and when Ben was just a young father, he and his wife opened their home, which was just a few blocks from my Maimonides in Boro Park to members of the community who couldn't make it home when they had a loved one who was hospitalized and members of the Orthodox Jewish community who wanted to stay close by the hospital on shabbos when it was not possible because of the sabbath restrictions for them to travel to and fro to the hospital. They literally had, as a Pessi describes, every week somebody staying in their home, and somebody sharing in the family's sabbath meal, a festive meal, becoming part of the family, every single week. Ben made his charity a reality an example every single day.

You know, as part of our sentencing submission, and I won't rehash this, we submitted about half a dozen letters from charitable organizations that Ben has devoted his time and his financial resources to.

And, you know, just coming before the Court, I find it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

notable that each of these organizations doesn't talk about
Ben's recent contributions, Ben's recent activity. They talk
about his long-standing activity, his long-standing investment
and commitment for their organizations because, you know, Ben
is not somebody who just started taking up charitable work when
he saw that he was in trouble. He has been doing this his
entire life, and he -- for him it is a part of who he is,
community service and doing what he can for others.

You know, I find, you know, the most touching and most illuminating aspects of Ben's community work to be the personal stories of individual help. There were, I think, dozens of those kinds of stories that his family, his friends, and community wrote about in their letters. They -- his children, his grandchildren wrote about how Ben routinely drops everything whenever he can help, just not just his kids, not just grandkids, not just those closest to him, but his distant family members, his friends of friends, employees, people in the wider community. Ben's grandson, Michael Friedman, who I believe is here today, talks in his letter about how Ben helped Michael' elderly relative. This is Michael -- Michael is Ben's grandson-in-law. So Michael's elderly relative is not really Ben's elderly relative? It is somebody Ben doesn't even know. When this better than person was stuck in Florida during the COVID lockdowns, you know, when the whole world of fearful of when was going to happen next, Ben dropped everything to help

this person who he did not know really. Michael recounts now "Without a second thought, Ben took charge he drove over an hour on several occasions to personally deliver food and whatever else was needed. When Michael's family member ended up in the hospital all alone, Ben was there to make sure he had everything he needs and was well cared for."

That story is not unique to Ben. It's just one example of many that highlights who Ben Werczberger is, everyone who wrote the Court had something special to say about Ben's community service.

Now, one final example of this that I want to highlight is that tremendous work that Ben and his wife have devoted in transforming their community in Deerfield Beach, Florida, which is a retirement community with mostly senior citizens into a welcoming place where every single one of those senior citizens has a place to go and feels welcomed, no matter who they are. The rabbi of that community of the synagogue who -- he, together with the Werczbergers, runs that community is here today, Rabbi Knobloch.

Ben's granddaughter, Shana Dembinsky, who has been to visit, she describes how everybody in the community loves Ben. They don't know everything that he does, they don't know how behind scenes he's working not to make sure that the community has a building or that people -- elderly people have transportation to the synagogue if they can't make it on their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

own. But those are things that Ben does without fanfare and without publicity and he does discreetly and they often go unnoticed, but Shana, his granddaughter, sees that this is Ben's very essence, and the community might not know the details because he doesn't publicize his work but they know the kind of work that Ben Werczberger is.

Now, a final aspect of Ben that I think is perhaps the most important thing that he has done in his life is his unmatched dedication to his three children, to his wife, to his more than a dozen grandchildren and to his even more great grandchildren. Ben has an unbelievably close relationship with his children and grandchildren, and that's what makes Ben, I think, truly special, truly a unique person. His most essential quality is being the rock of his family, as his daughter Esther Dembinsky, I think, put it, really, really, well. You know, many fathers are committed to their families, but I think that it's rare for a 72-year-old man with middle-aged children, 15 grandchildren, to be the go-to person for literally everybody. But that's Ben. No matter how busy he is, no matter what else he's doing, his children and his grandchildren know that they can count on him to put their needs first. Even during the pendency of this case and how stressful and difficult it's been for him, they have counted on Ben to be there for him first. I think one of his granddaughters put it really well in her letter, Rachel Kraus,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

she had that Ben is her 911, 311, and her first phone call in any emergency. That's really an extraordinary thing for a grandchildren to feel close enough with their grandfather for him to be there for their concerns and their needs for Ben to be their first line of moral support.

You know, Ben's superlative commitment to his family didn't just start when his responsibilities become lesser, you know, that of a grandfather. They began when he was a young father and when he was struggling to make ends meet, when he had multiple jobs. His kids though, they didn't know anything about any of that because Ben put them first. His daughter, Pessi, talks about how she remembers as a child her father could have the best day or the worst day, but we kids could never tell them apart because he was as joyful on the bad ones with the kids as he was on the good ones. Pessi, I think, really beautifully encapsulates Ben's commitment when she says, my dad dedicates his life to his kids, it doesn't matter what is going on outside of him, if we need him, he is there, along with all of his compassion and all of his grace. You know, there are literally countless stories in those letters about the little things that Ben has done for his grandchildren, how he was there when one was home sick, how he, you know, took the grandchildren for a special -- special occasions, you know, over the summer, and how I think, really, unbelievably, he escorted each and one every one of his grandchildren who was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to study abroad, he personally took them it study abroad, he took them to the dorm, he bought them their supplies, he was who escorted them into their first step into independence, and, you know, that is the kind of grandfather that he is, a hands-on grandfather who wants to make sure that every single little thing for his grandchildren is going well and is going right.

And, you know, I will say, as Ben's wife, Miriam, pointed out in her letter, she says amazingly, you know, what's amazing is not just that the grandfather wants to spend that kind of time with the grandchildren, is that the grandchildren want to spend that kind of time with elderly grandfather when they're, you know, teenagers and budding young adults. Miriam wrote the Court, amazingly, as teenagers and young adults, the grandchildren wanted to make that trip and transition to school and life abroad with their grandfather because that's the kind of close relationship that Ben has invested in every generation of his family, and he has a profound impact on his grandchildren and on his children. His son has taken over his And his grandchildren write how his commitment to hard work and his advice in their own career paths when they have struggled in making decisions in their own lives, his advice and his -- his inspiration is there for them.

His granddaughter, Riki, who is here, she says that her grandfather's words of advice and encouragement follow me

wherever I go. That is the kind of rare bond that Ben can only have built through time, through investment, and through real care. Few people in this world are as lucky as Ben
Werczberger's grandchildren to have the kind of grandfather that he is, who has devoted time, energy, to nurture every single one of them independently like a second father.

And this is the testament to Ben as a true patriarch. He's at patriarch because he happens to have many children and grandchildren. He is the real deal. He's a family man. And he has put his money where his mouth is throughout his entire life.

You know, as a family man, Ben has naturally, and I think quite painfully, opened up to his family about his guilt and his remorse in this case. He came clean to them about his mistakes as several of his children and friends wrote about in their letters, but, you know, what I think is particularly noteworthy is not just what Ben said to them but it is that because of their close relationship with Ben they can see his remorse expressed without, you know, without him speaking, they see it beyond just his words, that he's taken his criminal conduct seriously and that he's sorry for what he did.

These past 18 months, his daughter, Esther, writes, these past 18 months have really taken a toll on Ben. This mistake has been a huge burden to bear and a tremendous source of shame that he's struggling with daily.

And Miriam Werczberger, Ben's wife, who is the closest person to him in this world, she recounts that just knowing that Ben did wrong and the toll it's taken on their children and grandchildren has been immensely hard for Ben. He's always tried to set a good example for them and it pains him deeply knowing that he failed at the most important aspect of his

life. Miriam writes, I see the anguish and the fret that plagues Ben when he doesn't know I'm looking.

Ben's family has seen for the last two years how he has internalized his crime. And that's the real view of Ben Werczberger. Looking at who Ben is, looking at his life story, pulling himself up and building something successful through his hard work, looking at his dedication to his community and sharing the success that he enjoyed long before this case ever started and looking at his quintessential nature as a family man taken together, I submit, your Honor, that this felony conviction and a time-served sentence without more are sufficient but not greater than necessary for the person who Ben Werczberger really is.

And with that, I will turn over the rest of the presentation to Mr. Marks.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Haramati.

MR. MAZUREK: Judge, I just want to say a few words on the remaining 3553(a) factors and really focus on the differences between the parties in terms of what we are

requesting the Court to do at sentencing.

First, I would like to speak on the seriousness of the offense and what Mr. Wolf was talking about the need to promote due respect for the law and just punishment. There is no question, your Honor, that Mr. Werczberger is embarrassed, humiliated, and extremely remorseful for in any way causing the Court, the DHHS, the community, the government, the prosecutor's office to believe that he in any way wished to endanger the welfare of the schools — of the school that he lent considerable amounts of money to. He is absolutely remorseful for taking what was at the time using extremely bad judgment to take self-help measures to get a direct payment from Project Social Care into a bank account in the New York City and making those false representations to the bank and doing so.

He did that, your Honor, but in the -- I think it is important for you to understand the context in which he did.

Mr. Werczberger was not in the business of early daycare or childcare at all. That was not his business. His business, as Mr. Haramati spoke of at length, was developing the company as he did for a whole generation, 25 years of wholesale distribution company in different areas. He decided to take the risk that he did, the business risk he did by lending significant money to the New York City Early Learning Company, because he believed in it. He did the diligence. He visited

∥ O9AUWERS

the school. He saw the facilities. He was impressed by the ratio of day care providers to children. He was impressed with the school facilities for kitchen and providing nourishment for the children. He was impressed with the therapy and medical services that they provided. And for a period of time, he extended large amounts as one of the main creditors to New York City Early Learning. He did that because — not because he in any way wanted to steal money from the company, he wanted to make — he wanted to provide money for the company to continue to provide and believed it to be a good and reasonable business risk in doing that.

know, he has regretted ever since, and for which he is being rightfully punished today in this courtroom by taking that self-help measure and opening the bank account and taking a check directly in order for repayments of that loan. He did that because he extended — he went beyond his comfort zone. He went from two and a half to three and a half million and was concerned about repayments. But, your Honor, what Mr. Werczberger wants the Court to know, wants the government to know, and wants his family to know, and he's been trying to explain, he never intended went to do any harm to the school, in fact, the school itself, a for-profit company, showed that it provided quality day care, not just early health care, early head-start kids, but also to a number of other kids from

2.4

grades -- three-year-olds awe all the way up to the five-year-olds. He is very sorry for putting the organization and that head-start program in any theoretical conflict based on the credit that he extended to the school itself.

But let me say, your Honor, that with respect to the punishment that is just and requires due respect for the law and for deterrence purposes, I certainly think, you know, with respect to the specific deterrence you have a 72-year-old grandfather, great grandfather, and father, who I don't think there's any concern -- should be any concern that he would ever get close to this kind of conduct ever again. The lesson has been learned and learned considerably. In terms of the punishment and general deterrence, you know there are different defendants who were charged in this case in terms of the level of culpability that the government has already indicated,

Mr. Werczberger obtained this plea agreement because they found him to be on the lower end of the culpability scale.

Your Honor has already sentenced one other defendant in this scheme, Ms. Wong, and she was convicted also for the same kind of conflict of interest as Mr. Werczberger. She received misdemeanor. And, obviously, there is a very considerable difference between a misdemeanor penalty and a felony conviction.

You know, what Mr. Haramati said couldn't be more striking in terms of the fact that one of the traits that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Werczberger takes so much to heart is his being the rock for his family. He destroyed all of that in the judgments he made in this case. Even Mr. Wolf identified him as the patriarch. One of the things that Mr. Werczberger really always intended was to be that person that could be relied upon for doing not just the right thing financially for the family and building a business from scratch, coming from only a Yeshiva education and no college and no real high school, he wanted to make sure that in addition to providing that kind of stability he also would provide moral judgment stability and he failed them in that regard. It's not just that personal punishment that he faces, but the felony conviction, which, as your Honor knows, unfortunately, in today's society is a scarlet letter that you never -- that never leaves you. Mr.-the collateral consequences of that felony conviction are serious, severe, and practically real. Mr. Werczberger had to give up the company that he ran for over 23 years at the time of his arrest. Why? Because banks found him no longer -- a good credit risk, he was kicked out of banks, mortgages -- the mortgage banks started to foreclose on his properties, he even was losing the full term life insurance policies that he financed for long. So these are real day and actual consequences of a felony conviction. And they should not be taken lightly.

The real question, your Honor, I think the only

question that comes -- that the parties diverge on in our aspect of what we believe is a just and reasonable sentence under the Section 3553(a) factors and the clause is any special condition of release. Certainly, we defer to the Court as to whatever financial penalty you think is appropriate in order to give due credit to the Sentencing Reform Act's requirements. The special condition that the government seeks is a six-month home detention period, your Honor, and I believe that that is not necessary given the first one is sufficient but not greater than necessary under that statute.

Also, your Honor, in determining special conditions, as indicated in the government's sentencing memo at note 5 on page 9, the Second Circuit has taken a particular interest in sort of defining the contours of the discretion that a sentencing Court should have in determining what is a reasonably related special condition to the nature and circumstances of the offense and the personal history and characteristics of the defendant, and that's in Section 5D1.3 of the sentencing guidelines. We believe that this additional deprivation of liberty that the government requests is not reasonably related to these objectives. I think your Honor would be better suited to use the vitality of this 72-year-old great grandfather who has done great things in his life but made really bad judgments with respect to this loan to New York City Early Learning and how he took the self-help measures to

protect himself from that. Your Honor, you can use that vitality and not just say that he should be at home, he would — he loves to be home with his beautiful wife, obviously, and children and grandchildren but your Honor can add a condition which is more reasonably related to the offense conduct and to this particular defendant, and that is to add a community service obligation and requirement that connects perhaps to the educational industry, for which he was supposed to volunteer and give his good-faith volunteer service as a board member of the head-start program.

So for all of those -- for those hours that he may have not provided -- you know created that potential conflict of interest, your Honor can issue a special condition of probation or a supervised release that puts him back into the community to give back. As Ms. Haramati said, Mr. Werczberger, he's 72 years old, he has some health problems, as indicated in the probation report, he's had a hip replacement and he needs to go his knee replaced, but, you know what, what he wants to keep going, but, your Honor, instead of making him stay at home for six months, which can only do, I think, more mental health damage to him, I would ask that the Court consider putting him back out into the community, community service that the probation department can recommend to enable him to give back and do the kind of good things which his entire life has been structured around.

Sometimes good people do bad things, your Honor, and that is what the situation is, I respectfully submit is what happened here to Mr. Werczberger. But, your Honor, he is being punished. No doubt about it. A felony conviction is substantial. All the parties, I think, including the probation department, understand that there is no need to incarcerate Mr. Werczberger for this conduct. That would go beyond what is — what would be greater than necessary under the Sentencing Reform Act, but if the Court is considering special conditions beyond the standard conditions, we would ask that it tailor that special condition to something that is more apropos to the kind of offense conduct that Mr. Werczberger committed and also is consistent with his personal history and characteristics.

Your Honor, with respect to the financial penalty,
Mr. Werczberger has been brought a certified check, a bank
check, to court. He has a signed a consent order of
restitution in the amount of \$177,000 -- \$177,075, which
represents every penny of interest that he received from the
New York City Early Learning loan that was part of the offense
conduct here.

I also state just for the record, Mr. Werczberger didn't receive the full repayment of principal from New York City Early Learning. He still had -- so this turns out he did not gain anything financially from this conduct at all, and as I've said, he understands and accepts his responsibility and

1.3

2.2

his financial penalty is being paid on the very day of sentencing.

So, your Honor, with that, I would ask again that the Court consider an alternative to what the government proposes in terms of its special condition of probation. We believe that we — that the probation department's recommendation not to include such an additional deprivation of liberty should be also given credit by the Court. And so we ask that the Court sentence — we respectfully submit that the Court sentence Mr. Werczberger to time served two years of supervised release with the special condition of community service as opposed to what we believe would be wasting the assets of Mr. Werczberger in home detention.

We thank you.

If there are any questions, we are available.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Mazurek, I have a couple of questions for you. Community service had been on my mind also. However, I -- from the PSR and from the defense's submission, my understanding is that Mr. Werczberger is a very religious person and that he would be observing the sabbath and various holidays throughout the year. Is there a way that community service commitment could work?

I'd like to hear from Officer McMahon on that as well.

Is there a way that community service requirement could work in a situation where we have a person who, for

religious reasons, needs to be away from that commitment from time to time to carry out his religious obligations?

Why don't you speak to that, if you want to, Mr. Mazurek.

And I do want to hear from Officer McMahon as well.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor. Having represented other members, in fact, of this community, I do know that community service is something that -- I mean, there are organizations, one, that can help interface with probation, the Aleph Institute is one, it's A-L-E-P-H, that deals with helping people complete their sentences in probation, supervised release and community service, etc. They can interface to enable, to give enough advance time warnings to the organization or to carve out a schedule to ensure that whatever community service is being provided can be done in a way that's also consistent with his religion obligations and doesn't in any interfere with or make the community service less effective.

THE COURT: Okay. Officer McMahon.

MS. McMAHON: We would -- as far as like what the community service would look like, we would defer to the office that would be supervising him, the officer that would be responsible for overseeing his supervision. From our standpoint, if the Court were to impose community service, we would be looking at the number of hours that should be imposed.

And, generally, I believe it's 100 hours per year is like the standard. So, given that, there should be enough flexibility if there was, you know, a holiday or religious observance, it wouldn't be something so onerous, not something he would be doing seven days a week, that that couldn't be worked out.

THE COURT: I see.

MS. McMAHON: And I'm sure the officer would be looking to match the defendant up with a place that would -- you know, where you could utilize his skills, you know, but, again, we would defer to the office that would be supervising him and that officer.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

And, Mr. Mazurek, I also wanted to ask you, you referred to the consent order of restitution, which I do have here, and I will sign on today and put on the docket, but you also said something, I'm paraphrasing now, but something like whatever financial penalty the Court sees fit to impose. Did I have that right? Am I understanding that you do not object to a fine that's higher than \$9,500?

MR. MAZUREK: We do not, your Honor. If the Court believes that is necessary in order to satisfy the Sentencing Reform Act, that is correct. And we do, you know, think that that -- again, in asking Court to construct an overall sentence that is not sufficient but greater than necessary as part of the analysis that we ask the Court to consider in -- as opposed

2.4

to what the government has requested for purposes of this home detention because we do believe that the home detention is not necessary here, and is not going to fulfill the kinds of factors or be consistent with the factors under 3553(a).

And if I didn't say it before, the other thing about home detention, your Honor, is that it doesn't punish Mr. Werczberger as much as it does others. I mean, he has responsibilities to the 15 grandchildren and 17 great grandchildren. He has responsibilities to the -- there are over -- there are about 100 employees of Tiger Supplies, and sometimes his son, who was thrust into this business at the time of Mr. Werczberger's arrest, he needs to be on site to help with the administration of that business, and he also -- you know, he's founded a synagogue in Florida that also he's responsible for the operations of.

All of these things, you know, I do know that there is a need for the seriousness of this offense to be punished justly, but we just believe that that particular special condition is not necessary given the requirements of 5D1.3 of the guidelines and the Sentencing Reform Act.

So, if an additional financial penalty, an amount of community service, we believe those things are more reasonable and appropriate for purposes of sentencing this defendant.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Werczberger, would you like to say anything?

2.2

You're not required to speak, but you're invited to do so, if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I say it from here?

THE COURT: You may.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, speaking to you is one of the hardest things I've ever done. Admitting my mistakes and facing the harms that I've brought upon my family is painful in a way I cannot describe.

Judge, I'm a family man. My pride and joy in this world is being there for my wife --

THE COURT: Can he have a bottle of water?

THE DEFENDANT: My children, my grandchildren, and my great grandchildren, I want to make sure that they know --

THE COURT: Do you want to take a moment?

THE DEFENDANT: The last thing I want is to have my children and grandchildren worry about me but I know on this case, I've caused everyone so much heartache. Every time I speak to my family, I hear in their voices and I see in their eyes that they're afraid of what's going to happen to me. We can't be together, my children and grandchildren. The anxiety over my futures, it's unbearable that my actions caused my family such stress.

I spent a lot of time in my almost two years since my arrest from my just worrying over how I could have made such a stupid decision. I should have followed all of the rules more

carefully and not jeopardized my family's happiness, not cast a shadow on everything I've built over the last more than 50 years.

Your Honor, I worked very hard for what I have. As a young man, I went through several health crisis, worked multiple jobs that was physically draining and not paying much. I spent careful years budgeting to support my family of three beautiful children, providing the stable home and still repay my debts that weighed on me for years. Finally, after working hard for 20 years, I paid off all my debts. I struggled and set up a new business, which is still thriving today without me though.

Managing a successful business has its own challenges. Finding ways to grow the business without taking too much debt and risking everything and hiring the right employees who we could trust fully. My business was my pride. Having good credit, a stellar reputation, a stable company that supports my family was what I worked for so many years.

Because of my mistakes and the crime I'm here for today, my reputation is shattered. My credit is ruined. I've had to give up my business I've worked decades to build because my name and my crimes spoils everything I touch.

And the worst part is I know my children and grandchildren and great grandchildren can't look up to me as a role model. I can't tell my family that I hope they follow in

my footsteps. I hope they don't. My mistakes, I failed them.

I failed myself and I'm sorry for that.

Thank you, your Honor, for listening.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I'm just hope you'll bear with me for a couple of minutes while I think about what I've heard today.

(Pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: Counsel, is there any reason why should sentence should not be imposed at this time?

MR. MAZUREK: No, your Honor.

MR. WOLF: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am now going to describe the sentence that I intend to impose. I will give the lawyers an opportunity to make legal objections before the sentence is actually imposed.

In imposing a sentence, I am required to consider the factors that are set forth in 18, U.S.C., Section 3553(a). These factors include: First, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; second, for the sentence imposed to advance the purposes of sentencing, namely, to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, to provide the defendant with needed

educational, vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner; third, I must consider the kinds of sentences available; fourth, the guidelines range; fifth, any pertinent policy statements; sixth, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities; and, seventh, the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense, although that factor is not applicable here.

I've considered the recommendation of probation and the presentence report, the statements and submissions of counsel, and the letters submitted in support of Mr. Werczberger, including his own letter. I've also considered all of the Section 3553(a) factors, which I just recited. Ultimately, I am required to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the sentencing purposes in the statute. With respect to the guidelines I've already calculated the applicable range and we have discussed it, so I will not go over that again. In short, the range in this case is zero to six months' imprisonment. I will also note that the Court is bound by a mandatory statutory maximum of five years' imprisonment for this offense.

Against that backdrop, the defense requests a noncustodial sentence of time served, had previously requested supervised release of six months. Today, I believe Mr. Mazurek said that the defense does not object to a two-year term of supervised release.

Is that correct?

MR. MAZUREK: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. The government, for its part, seeks a guidelines sentence of time served along with two years of supervised release, subject to a six-month condition of home detention.

Probation recommends a sentence of time served and two years of supervised release. The report does not speak to any whether any portion of supervised release should consist of home detention.

Mr. Werczberger, I have struggled a bit to understand your case. Your counsel's thorough, detailed submission, together with the letters sent by numerous family members and friends portray you as a caring person, as a man of faith, as the patriarch of your family, as a rock, someone who everyone respect and relies on and as a highly successful businessman, who has generously shared his wealth with family and friends in need, with several charities, and has even built a synagogue, the group that is assembled here today underscores all of that. Your work, your generosity to charities and others, your dedication to your family and your success in business make it all the more confounding the turn that you took as you admitted at your guilty plea hearing you agreed with another person in November 2019 to represent to a bank that you were a president of New York City Early Learning Company, although you knew you

did not have that title, so that the bank would allow you to open an account in the name of New York City Early Learning Company. Additionally, you allocuted that you knew that was wrong, that the information you provided was false, and that it was provided for the purpose of influencing the actions at the bank.

In addition, although I heard from your counsel some points about regret relating to your betrayal of trust and the conflict of interest position that you put yourself in as part of committing the offense conduct, your own comments in your letter to me focused almost exclusively on the impact of that conduct on your family and yourself, not on the impact on the victim in this case, ACF, and on the public. While it is not unexpected for you to think about the toll on your family and on yourself, I would have expected to hear an expression of remorse for abusing the position of trust that you were put in.

With all of that in mind, I must impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, deters you from committing a crime like this again, and deters others from committing this crime. I have done so while taking into account some mitigating factors, including those acknowledged by the government, that Mr. Werczberger is 72 years old, as well as his relative culpability in this case. While these factors do not neutralize Mr. Werczberger's criminal conduct,

they are worthy of consideration.

With all of that said, I will state the sentence I intend to impose. Mr. Werczberger, after considering the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, I find that a sentence time served is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comport with the purpose the sentencing. I will order a term of two years of supervised release to be completed. In order to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment, and to afford adequate deterrence, I will order that the first three months of supervised release be subject to a condition of home detention. For those same reasons I will also order a special condition of 100 hours of community service, the specifics of which I will leave to the probation department to recommend.

Now, there are a couple of important matters related to home detention. Mr. Werczberger, while you are on home detention, you will be permitted to attend medical appointments, attend religious services, and attend to any employment related tasks, among other important obligations. This will all be worked out in consultation among you, your attorneys, and your probation officer. In addition, consistent with the practices in this district your home detention will be enforced through what is called location monitoring so that probation can ensure that you are where you are as needed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are different types of devices that probation might choose to use with respect to location monitoring. There is location monitoring through GPS, through radio frequency, and through a certain type of phone app. I'm not going to get into the specifics each of those, that goes beyond the traditional purview of the Court, but what I will say is this: leave it within probation's discretion to determine the type of location monitoring that can be used, under no circumstances shall the form of location monitoring interfere in any way with any religious holidays or observances during which the use of electronics and the like are prohibited. That is to say, if, for example, a certain form of location monitoring would require that Mr. Werczberger charge the device in the middle of a holiday during which charging devices and other use of electronics is not allowed, then that form of location monitoring is not to be used. Similarly, location monitoring check-ins with probation should not be scheduled during any hours in which Mr. Werczberger may be observing a holiday where the use of electronics and other practices are not allowed.

I will note that what I have just stated is based on information provided by and discussed with the probation department. In addition, other Courts under similar circumstances have made the necessary accommodations for defendants on home detention and home incarceration for similar reasons. See, for example, *United States v. Newman*. That's

S.D.N.Y. Case No. Cr. 439, and *United States v. Nordlicht*, E.D.N.Y. Case No. 16 Cr. 640.

I'm now going to read the remaining conditions of supervised release that you must comply with along with other details of your sentence: During your term of supervised release you will be subject to the mandatory conditions set forth on page 34 of the presentence report. Those can include the following: You must not commit another federal, state, or local crime. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. And you must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

As recommended by probation, I am waiving the mandatory drug testing condition.

You must not make restitution as I will further discuss with a moment.

In addition, the standard conditions of supervised release shall apply. Those are listed on pages 35 to 36 of the PSR and will be set forth in the judgment.

Would you like me to read the standard conditions to you, Mr. Werczberger?

MR. MAZUREK: No. That's not necessary, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I do want to stress one standard condition of supervision, and that is the following:

You must work full-time at least 30 hours per week at a lawful type of employment unless the probation officer excuses you

09AUWERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from doing so. I will, of course, leave it to probation to determine whether you are excused from that condition, but I will note for the record that Mr. Werczberger is retired and has significant financial resources to continue to support himself and any others who may depend on him. So, to the extent probation deems it prudent to excuse Mr. Werczberger from a mandated number of hours of employment, I support that determination.

You must also meet special conditions of supervised release that I will impose in addition to those that I have already discussed. First, you must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule. This condition is appropriate given the nature of the crime to which you have been convicted. Second, you must provide a probation officer with access to any requested financial information. This is to ensure compliance with any sentence regarding restitution. I'm going to recommend that you be supervised by the district of residence because you may be living in a district other than here in New York. With respect to a fine, the guidelines range is, for an offense level of 8, is \$2,000 to \$20,000. The parties' plea agreement stipulates to an applicable fine range of \$1,000 to \$9,500.

I note, Mr. Werczberger, that you completed a

1.3

2.2

financial affidavit as reflected in paragraphs 80 to 86 of the presentence report. Based on the information available to me, I conclude that you have not demonstrated an inability to remit a fine.

The probation department recommended that I impose a fine of \$15,000. The government, as previously noted, has urged that I impose a fine at the high end of the parties' stipulated guidelines range, a fine of \$9,500. I find that a fine is appropriate under the circumstances. The defense clarified today that it does not object to a fine that exceeds the top of the range reflected in the parties' plea agreement. I am imposing a fine at the top of the guidelines range for an offense level of 8, which is \$20,000.

Now, we come to restitution. The government has handed me a fully executed proposed order of restitution, which I will sign and docket at the conclusion of this proceeding. Additionally, I must impose a mandatory special assessment of \$100, which shall be due and payable immediately.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason other than anything we have already discussed as to why the sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. WOLF: No, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: Your Honor, I just have a couple of requests: Understanding that the three months' home detention must be completed within the two years of supervised release,

09AUWERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we respectfully do request, if the Court is amenable, if we could delay the period of three months' home detention until November 1<sup>st</sup> for a number -- a couple of reasons: First, Mr. Werczberger has a knee replacement surgery scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup>, and just for the purposes of maximum flexibility, and less, you know, I quess, coordination with probation, and, secondly, because of the religious holidays are in the month of October this year, for Rosh HaShanah and Yom Kippur and Succoth, that would give Mr. Werczberger again the maximum flexibility of going to different family members' homes during those religious holidays, again, without having to go through, you know, complicated, potentially, schedule -complicated scheduling with probation for home detention. we do ask if the Court would consider to start his period of home detention on November 1st of this year. And then we would ask that the residency that he would take up for this period would be his residence in Florida, so we would ask that he be supervised by the Southern District of Florida. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wolf, any response to that? MR. WOLF: Just give me a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. (Counsel confer)

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, we would leave it to the

09AUWERS

2.4

discretion of the Court. We've conferred with probation. The government is in agreement with probation that, as a practical matter, I think that the standard practice would be for the defendant to begin his term of home detention immediately after the sentence is imposed. We're unaware of any legal reason why that must be the case. And so with that, we defer to the Court's discretion.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. That had been my intention. But for the medical and religious reasons that Mr. Mazurek has cited, I will allow it. Mr. Werczberger may commence his period of home detention on November 1, 2024.

MR. MAZUREK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Werczberger, for the reasons I previously stated, it is the judgment of this Court that you be sentenced to time served and two years' supervised release. Your term of supervised release will be subject to the mandatory, standard, and special conditions I described. You are ordered to pay a fine of \$20,000 and a special assessment of \$100.

Before we adjourn, Mr. Wolf, are there any open counts?

MR. WOLF: Yes, your Honor. And the government respectfully requests they be dismissed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MAZUREK: We join in that application.

1 THE COURT: All right. I will dismiss the open 2 counts. 3 Mr. Werczberger, I advise you that you have the right 4 to appeal from the judgment imposing this sentence to the 5 extent you haven't waived it. If you are unable to pay the 6 costs of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma 7 pauperis. If that application were granted, you would be 8 permitted to appeal without the payment of any fees. 9 notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment 10 of conviction. 11 Mr. Wolf, is there anything else we should discuss 12 today? 13 MR. WOLF: No, your Honor. Thank you. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mazurek, anything else? 15 Thank you, your Honor. MR. MAZUREK: No. THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. So, 16 17 Ms. Haramati and Mr. Mazurek, I wish you well. 18 We're adjourned. 19 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. 20 000 21 22 23 24 25